

Minard et al.
USSN 10/762,998
Page 9

REMARKS

The undersigned appreciates the courtesy and helpful comments provided by Primary Examiner Levy during their recent interview of the application.

Claims 128, 143, 147, 161, 165, 174, 178, and 179 have been amended, claims 129, 133, 134, 148, 152, 153, 166, and 167 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 180-182 have been added. No new matter has been added. For instance, support for the amendments appears e.g. at page 16, lines 4-6 and the original claims of the application.

All the pending claims are method claims that call for administration to a *specified dog* and that feed materials have selected for *the specified dog*.

Applicants also direct attention to the of-record Rule 132 Declaration of co-inventor Paal Gisholt.

Claims 128-179 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

While Applicants disagree with the rejection, it is also believed the amendments made herein obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

Claims 128-144, 147-162, 165-175, 178 and 179 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103 over GB1474931 in view of Merck '67.

Claims 128-144, 147-162, 165-175, 178 and 179 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over GB1474931 in view of Merck '67 and Maturura et al. (EP 0609056).

For the sake of brevity, the two rejections are addressed in combination. Each of the rejections is traversed.

Minard et al.
USSN 10/762,998
Page 10

All the pending claims are method claims that call for administration to a *specified dog* and that feed materials have selected for *the specified dog*.

For instance, Applicants' independent claims 128, 147 and 165 read as follows:

Claim 128. A method for administering feed materials to a specified dog, comprising:
(a) providing a multiple-sectioned unitary package, the package comprising a plurality of package sections;
(b) adding to two or more package sections two or more distinct edible feed materials that have been selected for the specified dog,
the two or more package sections containing the two or more feed materials in an amount of within about 5 weight percent or less of a specified amount;
the two or more feed materials chosen from among feed, vitamins, minerals and protein supplements;
(c) administering the feed materials of the package to the dog.

Claim 147. A method for administering feed materials to a specified dog, comprising:
(a) providing a multiple-sectioned unitary package comprising a polymer material of construction,
the package comprising a plurality of package sections wherein each package section contains a distinct edible feed materials chosen from among feed, vitamins, minerals, chemical entities, electrolytes, proteins, and herbs;
the plurality of package sections containing the one or more feed materials in an amount of within about 5 weight percent or less of a specified amount, wherein the two or more feed materials have been previously selected for the specified dog;
(c) administering the feed materials of the package to the specified dog.

Claim 165. A method for administering feed materials to a specified dog, comprising:
(a) providing a multiple-sectioned unitary package comprising a polymer material of construction,
the package comprising a plurality of package sections wherein each package section contains one or more edible feed materials chosen from among two or more of feed, vitamins, minerals, electrolytes, proteins, and herbs, wherein the one or more feed material have been previously selected for the specified dog;
the plurality of package sections comprising distinct feed materials and the plurality of package sections containing the one or more feed materials in an amount of within about 5 weight percent or less of a specified amount;
(b) administering the feed materials of the package to the dog.

Minard et al.
USSN 10/762,998
Page 11

The cited documents, whether considered or in combination, clearly do not teach such methods.

Among other things, the customized packaging and administration for a specified dog as Applicants claim is nowhere suggested in the cited documents.

Thus, GB-1474931 does not mention or otherwise "adding to one or more package sections one or more edible feed materials *that have been selected for the specified dog*" as recited in each of Applicants' independent claims.

The Matsura document also is not relevant. Matsura merely reports a certain prescription composition. That composition is not selected for a particular dog. Use of a multiple-section package is not described in the Matsura document.

Moreover, of record is the Rule 132 Declaration of co-inventor Paal Gisholt, which details the significant commercial success provided by the claimed subject matters.

While Applicants firmly believe that a prima facie case under Section 103 has not been presented by the cited documents, it is also believed that any prima facie case that is contended to exist is fully rebutted by this Rule 132 Declaration.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested. See *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1978) ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art."). See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure §2143.03 ("To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.").

Minard et al.
USSN 10/762,998
Page 12

Claims 145, 146, 163, 164, 176 and 177 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over GB12474931 and Magnant et al. 5787839 and Pedigree and further in view of Merck '67. The rejection is traversed.

Deficiencies of GB1474931 have been discussed above and are incorporated here.

The Magnant et al. document merely reports a container to carry pet food when on trips or traveling. No incentive would have existed to somehow combine features of the freshly-slaughtered frozen offal reported in GB-1474931 with a travel pet container of Magnant et al.

Nor does Magnant either alone or in combination with any of the other cited documents suggest "adding to one or more edible feed materials *that have been selected for the specified dog*" as recited in Applicants' claims.

Applicants again note the submitted Rule 132 Declaration, which clearly rebuts any prima facie case under Section 103 that may be contended to exist.

Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. No. 33,860)
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
Tel. (617) 439-4444
Fax (617) 439-4170